

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	4344	COUNTY	Kern
APPLICANT	Shafter, City of	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$50,426
PROJECT TITLE	Shafter Regional Water Management Plan	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$67,235

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Prepare a new planning document that evaluates the water quality, supply and geography of the Shafter Regional Water System and prioritizes the development of water infrastructure for areas within City limits and unincorporated areas served by the City municipal water distribution system.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 6

Comment: The work plan is brief and lacks detail. The schedule and budget are defined, but also need more detail. Work will be performed within the requested time frame with the IRWMP to be completed by August 2006 and adoption by January 2007. The budget is reasonable, but lacks supporting documentation. Each work item was listed in the budget, but was only defined briefly in the work plan. Therefore, the benefit to a region other than the City of Shafter was uncertain. No performance review was suggested or planned within the work plan or budget.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The boundary of the region was not clearly defined. The boundary was assumed to be either the city limits or the Regional Water Service system (service area), as defined by the maps in the application. The City of Shafter is within a region that has the need for water management at a local level. There was no mention of how the proposed IRWMP will tie into other regional plans or efforts outside the city limits or the service area.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 2

Comment: The local watershed and service area were discussed; however, they are not tied to the work plan. The work plan simply states that it should meet the "Regional Priorities" as objectives for the local watershed as set forth by the RWQCB, but does not explain how this will be accomplished. Planning objectives mention documenting current watershed condition, yet the work items are for the city limits and the applicant's water system, which are smaller than the watershed. The IRWMP would study groundwater quality beneath the City of Shafter, system operations, and BMPs.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 2

Comment: No water management strategies were identified. The work plan did not detail any of the work, but discusses items the IRWMP would include. Multiple agency integration or resource processes were not discussed in any detail.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 2

Comment: The applicant does not have a schedule for implementation beyond adoption; an institutional structure to ensure project implementation; or a process in the proposal that allows for monitoring the performance, implementation, and changes to the IRWMP. The applicant states that implementation of any infrastructure improvement may trigger CEQA requirements, but did not expound upon this issue. Other references to implementation were not specifically part of the work plan.

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: The applicant states that the IRWMP is a planning document and therefore they intend to file a NOE to comply with CEQA. Otherwise, implementation of the IRWMP may trigger CEQA requirements on a project by project basis. The work plan does not discuss analysis of the potential impacts or benefits within the region and adjacent areas.

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The IRWMP will study the water demand, water quality, and geology to determine water quality trends. The application indicated use of modeling software, but did not provide details or explain how data would be analyzed relative to the IRWMP.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The work items include obtaining and reviewing water quality data for existing wells, documenting trends in water quality, obtaining well logs to evaluate geology, modeling the water system, monitoring to evaluate pollutants, and reporting on new wells in the surrounding areas. The analyses of water quality trends would include coordination with local water and irrigation districts. However, there was no indication exactly how data management processes would be conducted. Public review was mentioned, but no discussion was found on how data would support statewide needs or be disseminated to stakeholders, agencies, and the public.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: Stakeholders are not directly mentioned in the proposal, but working with local districts was. No indication was provided that stakeholders were consulted. Inviting City residents to be involved in the IRWMP could have been considered. No public meetings were discussed.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 1

Comment: There was no discussion regarding DACs.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The work plan mentions that they are in the process of developing a 2005 UWMP, but the application contained no discussion of what the UWMP would entail. There was no other discussion regarding local planning efforts that could form a foundation for the IRWMP or relate to IRWM management strategies.

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The work plan does not have a clear description of how agency coordination will be conducted or any cooperation would be done with any entities outside the city limits. The application merely stated that the IRWMP's preparation "must be coordinated with multiple water-based regulatory agencies, neighboring water and irrigation districts and other local water stakeholders."

TOTAL SCORE: 30